Gödel solution in the bumblebee gravity

J. R. Nascimento,[1,*] A. Yu. Petrov,[1,†] A. F. Santos,[2,‡] and W. D. R. Jesus[2,§]

[1] *Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal da Paraíba*
Caixa Postal 5008, 58051-970, João Pessoa, Paraíba, Brazil

[2] *Instituto de Física, Universidade Federal de Mato Grosso,*
78060-900, Cuiabá, Mato Grosso, Brazil

arXiv:1407.5985v1 [hep-th] 22 Jul 2014

Abstract

Here, we consider a gravity theory involving a spontaneous Lorentz symmetry breaking called the bumblebee model. We show that, at certain values of the bumblebee field, the Gödel metric is consistent within this theory.

*jroberto@fisica.ufpb.br

†petrov@fisica.ufpb.br

‡alesandroferreira@fisica.ufmt.br

§willian.xb@gmail.com

The general relativity and the standard model are certainly the cornerstones of the modern physics verified through many experimental tests with a very high level of exactness. Despite the success of these theories, there are some open questions, such as, for example, a consistent quantum description of the gravity which has not been found up to now (all known gravity models either non-renormalizable or involve ghosts), modified gravity models which can explain the accelerated expansion of the Universe, and the problem of the unified theory of the fundamental interactions. Within the attempts to solve these problems, the idea of the Lorentz symmetry breaking began to attract the attention. It resulted in formulating the Lorentz-breaking extension of the standard model [1] which involves all known interactions and the Lorentz-violating terms. An excellent review on the extension of the standard model is given in [2].

The Lorentz symmetry breaking can be implemented in two different forms: in an explicit form, when the corresponding term presents in the Lagrangian from the very beginning, or in a spontaneous form, when one of vector (in general, tensor) fields acquires a non-zero vacuum expectation value. The spontaneous symmetry breaking methodology is treated as a more elegant form to study Lorentz symmetry violation [3] since in this case the constant vector (or tensor) emerges in a more natural way. The typical model used to study the spontaneous Lorentz symmetry breaking is the bumblebee model discussed in many details in [4–7].

By its essence, the bumblebee model involves a vector field B_μ which acquires a non-zero vacuum expectation value:

$$\langle B_\mu \rangle = b_\mu, \tag{1}$$

where b_μ is a constant vector, thus, we have a spontaneous Lorentz symmetry breaking.

The general form of the Lagrangian for the bumblebee model is, see f.e. [4]:

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_0 - V(B_\mu B^\mu \mp b^2) + \mathcal{L}_m, \tag{2}$$

where the choice of the sign $\mp$ is discussed further, and the $\mathcal{L}_0$ is a kinetic term looking like

$$\mathcal{L}_0 = \mathcal{L}_{EH} + \mathcal{L}_B, \tag{3}$$

with $\mathcal{L}_{EH}$ is an Einstein-Hilbert Lagrangian given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{EH} = \frac{1}{16\pi G}\left[R - 2\Lambda\right], \tag{4}$$

and $\mathcal{L}_B$ is a Lagrangian for the bumblebee field B_μ [8]

$$\mathcal{L}_B = \left[\sigma_1 B^\mu B^\nu R_{\mu\nu} + \sigma_2 B^\mu B_\mu R - \frac{1}{4}\tau_1 B_{\mu\nu}B^{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2}\tau_2 D_\mu B_\nu D^\mu B^\nu + \frac{1}{2}\tau_3 D_\mu B^\mu D_\nu B^\nu\right], \quad (5)$$

with $B_{\mu\nu} = D_\mu B_\nu - D_\nu B_\mu$ is a stress tensor.

Here, we study the Kostelecky-Samuel model [3], where the Lagrangian $\mathcal{L}_0$ assumes a form of the Einstein-Maxwell Lagrangian which reduces to the Maxwell Lagrangian in the flat space, so, the parameters σ_1, σ_2, τ_2 e τ_3 vanish, while $\tau_1 = 1$. So, we rest with

$$\mathcal{L}_0^{KS} \equiv \mathcal{L}_{KS} = \frac{1}{16\pi G}(R - 2\Lambda) - \frac{1}{4}B_{\mu\nu}B^{\mu\nu}. \quad (6)$$

The spontaneous Lorentz symmetry breaking is generally induced through a potential in the corresponding Lagrangian [9]. There are different possibilities for choice of the potential, here we choose the quartic one:

$$V = \frac{1}{2}\kappa\left(B_\mu B^\mu \mp b^2\right)^2, \quad (7)$$

where κ and b^2 are essentially positive constants to provide the existence of minima. This potential, first, does not involve any extra field, second, vanishes at the minimum together with its first derivative. The $\mp$ sign reflects the fact that the vector B^μ can be time-like as well as space-like (in the Gödel case we study here, time-like B_μ yields $B^\mu B_\mu < 0$ since for the time-like $B_\mu = (b, 0, 0, 0)$, and $g^{00} = -\frac{1}{a^2}$, one has $B^\mu B_\mu < 0$). In this case, our Lagrangian takes the form

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{16\pi G}(R - 2\Lambda) - \frac{1}{4}B_{\mu\nu}B^{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2}\kappa\left(B_\mu B^\mu \pm b^2\right)^2 + \mathcal{L}_m. \quad (8)$$

The dynamics of the gravitational sector is described by the Einstein equations:

$$G_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi G T_{\mu\nu}, \quad (9)$$

where $G_{\mu\nu}$ is an usual Einstein tensor

$$G_{\mu\nu} = R_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2}g_{\mu\nu}R, \quad (10)$$

and $T_{\mu\nu}$ is an energy-momentum tensor of the matter composed by two parts:

$$T_{\mu\nu} = T^M_{\mu\nu} + \mathcal{T}^B_{\mu\nu}, \quad (11)$$

where $T^M_{\mu\nu}$ is an energy-momentum tensor of the usual matter (for example, relativistic fluid), and $\mathcal{T}^B_{\mu\nu} \equiv \frac{T^B_{\mu\nu}}{8\pi G}$ corresponds to the bumblebee field, so that $T^B_{\mu\nu}$ is given by [4, 10]:

$$T^B_{\mu\nu} = B_{\mu\alpha}B_{\nu}{}^{\alpha} - \frac{1}{4}g_{\mu\nu}B_{\alpha\beta}B^{\alpha\beta} - Vg_{\mu\nu} + 2V'B_{\mu}B_{\nu}, \tag{12}$$

where V' is a derivative of the potential with respect to the argument, that is, $V' = \frac{\partial V}{\partial X}\Big|_{X=B_\mu B^\mu \pm b^2}$.

In this paper, we verify the consistency of the Gödel metric [11] within the bumblebee gravity. The fundamental feature of this solution is the presence of the closed timelike curves (CTCs) which inspired an intensive discussions on the causality and time travels in the gravity context(on these issues see f.e. [12]). Besides of this, the Gödel solution is interesting since it describes an Universe with the rotating matter and non-zero cosmological constant. An extensive discussion of causality aspects of the Gödel metric can be found in [13]. Some issues related to consistency of the Gödel solutions in different gravity models are discussed in [14].

The Gödel metric looks like

$$ds^2 = a^2\Big[dt^2 - dx^2 + \frac{1}{2}e^{2x}dy^2 - dz^2 + 2e^x dt\, dy\Big], \tag{13}$$

where a is a constant. To study the Einstein equation (9) for a metric (13), we need to find the non-zero components of the Einstein tensor (10). To do it, we write down the non-zero components of the Ricci tensor:

$$\begin{aligned} R_{00} &= 1 \\ R_{02} &= R_{20} = e^x \\ R_{22} &= e^{2x}, \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

with the scalar curvature is

$$R = \frac{1}{a^2}. \tag{15}$$

With (14) and (15), we determine the left-hand side of the Eq. (9), that is, the geometrical part. It remains to find the energy-momentum tensor of the matter. One of its parts is the energy-momentum tensor of the relativistic fluid which was introduced in the original paper [11]:

$$T^M_{\mu\nu} = \rho u_\mu u_\nu + \Lambda' g_{\mu\nu}, \tag{16}$$

where $u_\mu = (a, 0, ae^x, 0)$ e $\Lambda' = \frac{\Lambda}{8\pi G}$, with Λ is a cosmological constant. Another part of the energy-momentum tensor is associated to the bumblebee field B_μ given in (12). To find the components of the energy-momentum tensor, we choose the form of the field B_μ, which, in the vacuum, must satisfy

$$g^{\mu\nu} B_\mu B_\nu = \pm b^2, \tag{17}$$

to provide a minimum for the potential.

As a first attempt, we choose

$$B_\mu = (ab, 0, 0, 0), \tag{18}$$

which evidently satisfies a condition of the vacuum (17). Therefore, the potential vanishes, and the energy-momentum tensor takes the form

$$T^B_{\mu\nu} = B_{\mu\alpha} B_\nu{}^\alpha - \frac{1}{4} g_{\mu\nu} B_{\alpha\beta} B^{\alpha\beta}. \tag{19}$$

With a choice (18) we have that only $B_0 \neq 0$ is a constant, thus, the stress tensor $B_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu B_\nu - \partial_\nu B_\mu = 0$ vanishes (we remind that $\nabla_\mu B_\nu - \nabla_\nu B_\mu = \partial_\mu B_\nu - \partial_\nu B_\mu$, with the terms with the Christoffel symbols cancel each other), so, one has

$$T^B_{\mu\nu} = 0, \tag{20}$$

i.e., all components of the energy-momentum tensor of the field B_μ are zero. We note that in principle the bumblebee field must satisfy also its equations of motion [10]:

$$\nabla_\mu B^{\mu\nu} = 2V'(B^2) B^\nu, \tag{21}$$

however, for the constant B^μ corresponding to the vacuum, and for our choice of the potential, this equation is identically satisfied.

The situation does not differ, that is, we again have the fields B_μ corresponding to the vacuum, together with vanishing of the energy-momentum tensor, $T^B_{\mu\nu} = 0$ because of the annihilation of the tensor $B^{\mu\nu}$ equation of motion for B^μ identically satisfied, for two other choices of B_μ:

$$B_\mu = (0, ab, 0, 0), \tag{22}$$

$$B_\mu = (0, 0, 0, ab). \tag{23}$$

Therefore, for these three choices of the B_μ field, (18), (22) and (23), the equations of motion (9) are reduced to those ones obtained by Gödel in [11], thus, we conclude that in these cases the Gödel metric is consistent with the spontaneous Lorentz breaking. So, the CTCs persist in this case in the same way as in [11]. Thus, we convinced that all values of the B_μ field corresponding to the vacuum and vanishing of the $B_{\mu\nu}$ tensor at the same time are compatible with the Gödel metric. Indeed, in these cases the equations of motion of the bumblebee field are satisfied identically, and its energy-momentum tensor vanishes, thus, the additive terms in the Einstein equations involving the bumblebee field completely disappear.

Now, let us try the more sophisticated situation, that is, let us suppose that the B_μ field corresponds to the vacuum but the $B_{\mu\nu}$ does not vanish (in particular, this is the case when B_μ is directed along y axis). We note that if we restrict our consideration to the vacuum case (otherwise we will have no spontaneous Lorentz symmetry breaking but only a simple dynamics of the bumblebee field away from the vacuum which does not principally differ from other fields, and this situation is not interesting for us since our aim consist namely in keeping track of the spontaneous Lorentz symmetry breaking), with the quartic potential as it has been done above, our equation of motion reduces to

$$\partial_\mu B^{\mu\nu} + \Gamma^\mu_{\mu\lambda} B^{\lambda\nu} = 0. \tag{24}$$

It is known that for the Gödel metric, the only non-zero Christoffel symbol with coinciding upper and lower indices is $\Gamma^0_{01} = 1$. So, if we suggest all fields to depend only on $x_1 = x$ as the components of the Gödel metric do, we get

$$\partial_1 B^{1\nu} + B^{1\nu} = 0, \tag{25}$$

thus, the solution for the stress tensor is $B^{1\nu} = k^\nu e^{-x}$, with k^ν is a some constant vector. It is clear that its x component vanishes, $k^1 = 0$, which means that B^1 component cannot be restricted from this equation. Actually, we will determine appropriate restrictions on B^1 afterwards. Further, since there is no dependence on other coordinates, the value of B^μ corresponding to this stress tensor yields $B^{1\nu} = \partial^1 B^\nu = k^\nu e^{-x}$, so, one has $B^\nu = -k^\nu e^{-x}$ (with, again, $\nu \neq 1$).

Now, it remains to find whether such a B^ν can yield a vacuum condition (17). Taking into account the structure of the Gödel metric, one finds that the (17) implies in the following

relation for B^μ

$$a^2((B^0)^2-(B^1)^2+2e^xB^0B^2+\frac{1}{2}e^{2x}(B^2)^2-(B^3)^2)=\pm b^2. \tag{26}$$

If we take into account that $B^\nu=-k^\nu e^{-x}$ (except of $\nu=1$), with a constant k^ν, one gets from this:

$$a^2((k^0)^2e^{-2x}-(B^1)^2+2e^{-x}k^0k^2+\frac{1}{2}(k^2)^2-e^{-2x}(k^3)^2)=\pm b^2. \tag{27}$$

It implies $B^1\equiv -b_1=const$, $k^0k^2=0$ and $(k^0)^2-(k^3)^2=0$. We denote $k^2\equiv q$ (one should remind that it is a constant) The simplest choice is $k^0=k^3=0$, i.e. $B^0=B^3=0$, with the vacuum condition $g_{\mu\nu}B^\mu B^\nu=\pm b^2$ takes the form

$$a^2(\frac{q^2}{2}-(b_1)^2)=\pm b^2. \tag{28}$$

We note that, if we try other choice of the vacuum, that is, $k^0=k^3=\frac{d}{a}$, with $k^2=0$, we will have $B_{01}=-B_{31}=-ade^{-x}$, which gives $T^B_{33}=0$, but $T^B_{11}=-d^2e^{-2x}$, $T^B_{00}=-2d^2e^{-2x}$, $T^B_{02}=-d^2e^{-x}$, $T^B_{22}=-\frac{d^2}{2}$. Taking into account the explicit form of the Einstein tensor (in our case, its components involve the same exponentials as the correspondent components of the Ricci tensor and the metric tensor), we see that such a form of the energy-momentum tensor of the bumblebee field is inconsistent with the Einstein equations in the Gödel metric case while $d\neq 0$.

So, we restricted the vacuum field B^μ to be $B^\mu=(0,-b_1,-qe^{-x},0)$, with $q=\pm\sqrt{2b_1^2\pm\frac{2b^2}{a^2}}$. It is more convenient to use the lower-index vector $B_\mu=(-a^2q,a^2b_1,-\frac{a^2q}{2}e^x,0)$, with q and b_1 are related through (28). Let us verify the consistency of this case with the Einstein equations. We get the only non-zero component of the stress tensor $B_{12}=-B_{21}=-\frac{a^2q}{2}e^x$. So, the energy-momentum tensor of the bumblebee field is reduced to (19), whose non-zero components have the following explicit form

$$\begin{aligned}
T^B_{00} &= -\frac{a^2q^2}{4}, \quad T^B_{02}=-\frac{a^2q^2}{4}e^x,\\
T^B_{11} &= -\frac{a^2q^2}{4},\\
T^B_{22} &= -\frac{3}{8}a^2q^2e^{2x}, \quad T^B_{33}=\frac{a^2q^2}{4}.
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

And the non-zero components of the "usual" matter energy-momentum tensor (16) are:

$$\begin{aligned} T^M_{00} &= \rho a^2 + \Lambda' a^2, \quad T^M_{02} = \rho a^2 e^x + \Lambda' a^2 e^x, \\ T^M_{11} &= -\Lambda' a^2, \\ T^M_{22} &= \rho a^2 e^{2x} + \frac{1}{2}\Lambda' a^2 e^{2x}, \quad T^M_{33} = -\Lambda' a^2. \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

Using Eqs. (14), (15), (29) and (30), we get the following modified Einstein equations:

$$\begin{aligned} (00): \frac{1}{2} &= 8\pi G\rho a^2 + \Lambda a^2 - \frac{a^2 q^2}{4}, \\ (11): \frac{1}{2} &= -\Lambda a^2 - \frac{a^2 q^2}{4}, \\ (22): \frac{3}{2} &= 16\pi G\rho a^2 + \Lambda a^2 - \frac{3}{8} a^2 q^2, \\ (33): \frac{1}{2} &= -\Lambda a^2 + \frac{a^2 q^2}{4}. \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

The equation for the (02) component is identical to that one for the (00) component with only difference in the overall factor e^x both in left-hand side and right-hand side of the equation.

We see that the system is overdetermined (it involves only three variables but four equations) – it is interesting to note that actually, the system of equation in the case of the Gödel metric is overdetermined also in other gravity models, such as Chern-Simons gravity and the Horava-Lifshitz gravity [14]. The only consistent solution corresponds to the case $q = 0$ when the system is reduced to the usual case [11], and so, $8\pi G\rho = \frac{1}{a^2}$, $\Lambda = -4\pi G\rho$. It is interesting to discuss now the case $q = 0$. The situation with a nontrivial symmetry breaking (that is, $b \neq 0$) is when the potential is $V = \frac{\kappa}{2}(B^\mu B_\mu + b^2)^2$, so, $B^\mu = (0, -b_1, 0, 0)$ is space-like, and the sign in the r.h.s. of (28) is $(-)$, i.e. one has $b_1^2 = \frac{b^2}{a^2}$. It means that in this case the bumblebee field is directed just along the x axis, and, moreover, it is constant, so, indeed, the stress tensor for B_μ is forced to vanish. Actually, we have showed that the Gödel solution is consistent with the bumblebee gravity only if the stress tensor vanishes.

Let us make the conclusions. We have shown that in the bumblebee gravity, the Gödel solution can be found for one of the vacua of the theory only if the stress tensor of the bumblebee field vanishes. Therefore, we found that the spontaneous breaking of the Lorentz symmetry can be compatible with the existence of the CTCs only in certain situations, that is, if B_μ is a constant vector (so, the stress tensor $B_{\mu\nu}$ vanishes) corresponding to the

vacuum, while in other cases the consistency is jeopardized. Therefore, we can conclude that some forms of the spontaneous symmetry breaking allow to rule out the CTCs.

Acknowledgments. This work was partially supported by Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnológico (CNPq). A. Yu. P. has been supported by the CNPq project 303438/2012-6 and A. F. S. has been suported by the CNPq project 476166/2013-6.

---

[1] V. A. Kostelecky and R. Potting, Phys. Rev. D 51, 3923 (1995); D. Colladay and V.A. Kostelecky, Phys. Rev. D 55, 6760 (1997); Phys. Rev. D 58, 116002 (1998);

[2] R. Bluhm, Lect. Notes Phys. 702, 191 (2006), arXiv: hep-ph/0506054.

[3] V. A. Kostelecky and S. Samuel, Phys. Rev. D 40, 1886 (1989); Phys. Rev. D 39, 683 (1989); Phys. Rev. Lett. 63, 224 (1989).

[4] V. A. Kostelecky, Phys. Rev. D 69, 105009 (2004), hep-th/0312310.

[5] R. Bluhm and V. A. Kostelecky, Phys. Rev. D 71, 065008 (2005).

[6] R. Bluhm, S.-H. Fung. and V. A. Kostelecky, arXiv: 0712.4119.

[7] O. Betolami, J. Paramos, Phys. Rev. D72, 044001 (2005), hep-th/0504215.

[8] C. M. Will, *Theory and experiment in gravitational physics*. Cambridge University Press, 1993.

[9] R. Bluhm, arXiv: 1302.2278.

[10] M. D. Seifert, Phys. Rev. D81, 065010 (2010), arXiv: 0909.3118.

[11] K. Gödel, Rev. Mod. Phys. **21**, 447 (1949).

[12] F. M. Paiva, M. Reboucas, A. F. F. Teixeira, Phys. Lett. A126, 168 (1987); M. S. Morris, K. S. Thorne, Am. J. Phys., 56, 395 (1988); S. W. Kim, K. S. Thorne, Phys. Rev. D43, 3929 (1991).

[13] M. Reboucas, J. Tiomno, Phys. Rev. D **28**, 1251 (1983); M. Reboucas, M. Aman, A. F. F. Teixeira, J. Math. Phys. **27**, 1370 (1985); M. O. Calvao, M. Reboucas, A. F. F. Teixeira, W. M. Silva, Jr, J. Math. Phys. **29**, 1127 (1988); J. Fonseca-Neto, A. Yu. Petrov, M. Reboucas, Phys. Lett. B725, 412 (2013), arXiv: 1304.4675.

[14] C. Furtado, T. Mariz, J. R. Nascimento, A. Yu. Petrov, A. F. Santos, Phys. Rev. D79, 124039 (2009), arXiv: 0906.0554; C. Furtado, J. R. Nascimento, A. Yu. Petrov, A. F. Santos, Phys. Lett. B693, 494 (2010), arXiv: 1004.5106; Phys. Rev. D84, 047702 (2011), arXiv: 1106.4003.